The key reader has spacing marks 7a - 7d located at a forward end to indicate the spacing of the wafers located within the key reader 2. The reader bar 2 may be passed or slide through the basic key reader 1 until it touches the wafer 10 and then a reading may be taken at point 5. At 16 there is shown a depth graph chart. To answer the examiner's question: Is this referring to the bend 2a being engaged in the opening 19a or does the entire bar pass through the opening 19a? The answer is no. There are two openings in the basic reader bar. The first one is 19b being used to take different readings of the reader bar 2 when in different positions. The second opening 19a is designed for the bend 2a of the reader bar to be locked in a certain position within the opening 19a so that certain readings can place and the reader bar 2 cannot slide out of the basic key reader on its own to be accidentally lost. The opening 19a does not partake in any of the readings of the sliding bar when certain positions or depth are being determined. In view of all of the above, it is believed that what is claimed flows from the specification and the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the above noted objections.

Applicant has noted that the drawing corrections supplied early have not been approved. The submission of corrected drawings are submitted and are believed to comply with 37 CFR 1.121.

Claims 1 - 3 are objected to because of certain informalities. It is believed that the explanations given with the objections to the specification will equally satisfy the objections raised with regard to claims 1- 3.

Claim 1, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Dobbs. The applicant considers the Dobbs invention to be a side bar reader while applicant's claimed invention is not capable to function as a side bar reader. In contrast thereto, the applicant uses a slide bar which is quite different from a side, which is well known in the key art. Therefore, the tool of Dobbs is considered to be non-analogous art in the key lock area. The examiner states that

"the sliding bar reader also includes a bend just below numeral 101 in Fig. 2 which is locked within another opening 87 of the reader to prevent the loss of the reader". Where in the Dobb's disclosure can this statement be found? There is no slide bar or slide bar reader in Dobbs. The bend (just below the numeral 101 in Fig. 2) is no bend in the sense claimed by applicant. It is merely a wire that is guided in a curve of a channel. This is not what applicant is claiming and therefore, this reference to Dobbs cannot anticipate what is claimed in claim 1.

Claim 2, as best as understood, (the examiner in this rejection, appears to understand what is claimed in claim 2 very well) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell in view of Herzenberg. The examiner states that "McConnell teaches a system for duplicating keys including a basic key reader 14 and a sliding bar reader 32 for touching and determining the location, depths and spaces of wafers within a lock, and reading information at 80, 82 in an opening or groove 30 (see column 4, line 13) of the head of the reader)". The examiner is incorrect in observing that the groove 30 of McConnell is the equivalent of applicant's claimed opening 19b at the head of the key reader. The groove 30 of McConnell merely holds the sliding bar in place and without it, the reading instrument would be useless. The Examiner now uses Herzenberg to teach the use of identical colors in McConnell. (see color match of column 5, line 51. The color matching in Herzenberg is totally alien to the color matching disclosed and claimed by applicant. In Herzenberg, in the column proffered by the Examiner, there is a card 80 which includes, for each location in which individual keys 14, 16, 56, and 57 can be stored within section 62, a first section that can be colored to match the match the color of the tab 36 of the adjacent key and a second area 84. This has nothing to do with what is claimed. Applicant's purpose of the color scheme is to identify any reader to their appropriate instruments and to identify the instruments to the various makes of automobiles. For example, Chrysler may a blue and GM may have red. Therefore,

to use Herzenberg to make the knob 36 of McDonnell, (there is no Knob in McDonnell) in a color identification. In view of the teachings of Herzenberg. This teaching does not flow from the teachings of Herzenberg but is being gleaned from applicant's specification. This is impermissible in rejecting claims.

Claim 3, as best understood is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over McConnell in view of Nail and Heredia. It takes three references to reject this claim. Is the second reference the same as the third, or are there used in the alternative? The Examiner does not indicate what Nail teaches and therefore this rejection is considered to be moot. It is pointed out to the examiner that the disclosure of Nail is directed to an entire different lock mechanism, that is, it is directed to a pin-type tumbler lock which is altogether different from a wafer type lock which is being claimed in claim 3. Therefore, the reference to Nail could not be combined with the base reference McConnell. In Nail, a record can be made of the positions of the levers 82 - 90 which is different from applicant reading certain positions of the slider bar in openings in the basic key reader. This then, changes the reading indicia obtained from the decoding instrument of Nail. The criteria to obtain and identify information with vehicles having identical specification, as claimed in claim 3, is not taught by Nail.

With regard to Heredia, the use of this reference to obviate data readings from a base key reader is not understood. The reference to Heredia is directed to help an operator to be able to select key blank to be compatible with an unknown key blank. It is not seen how this disclosure can be combined with McConnell to reject claim 3. The disclosure of Heredia is only concerned with selecting key blanks and compare the selection to various vehicles of different makes. However, this disclosure cannot modify McConnell to transfer the readings of that reference to a code card as is claimed. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 cannot stand because the

references to Nail and Heredia do not make obvious what is claimed in claim 3.

In view of all of the above, it is believed that all objections and rejections raised in the Examiner's DETAILED ACTION have been taken care of and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to an early indication of allowance. If, in spite of all of the above, the Examiner is not convinced of the patentability of claims 1 - 3 and an "Advisory Action is issued, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this amendment and the arguments contained therein into the application for the purposes of appeal.

Steven G. Mathena

Date. 7-24-06

(Second Replacement of the second paragraph on page 2)

Detailed Description of the Invention

Fig. 1 illustrates the key reader or blank 1 that includes the reader bar 2 which is movable in and out of the basic key reader. The reader bar 2 has a forward end 3 which is slanted backward at a 48 degree angle. At the tip of the key reader there is a slot 4 having a depth of .045" and a width of ~~3/16'~~ 3/16". The reader bar 2 has an alignment mark 5 for the purpose to be explained below. The key reader has spacing marks 7a - 7d located along the forward end to indicate the spacing of the wafers located within the key reader 2. The reader bar has marks 8a - 8e to indicate where a depth reading takes place. These marks can be read in an opening 19b in the head of the basic key reader. The knob 7 at the outer end of the reader bar 2 is color coded to coincide with color coding of the key reader. In this way, it can always be determined which reader 2 belongs to or is associated with which key reader, which has not been able to be done here to fore.